



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Upon the worlds' high altars, in all time,  
The gathered wisdom of six thousand years,  
Embalmed in prose and songs of many lands  
And peoples? Who the magic scales can hold  
Wherewith to weigh ethereal elements,  
And mark their value in the wealth of mind?  
None but their Maker. This howe'er we know,  
That he, of all mankind, wherever found,  
Who most hath done to serve his fellow men,  
He is by right the king of men.

August, 1893.

## THE SOCIAL AND MORAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

"And he shall speak peace unto the nations."—Zech. 9:10.

SERMON PREACHED BEFORE THE CHICAGO PEACE CONGRESS,  
SUNDAY, AUG. 20, 1893, BY REV. PHILIP S. MOXOM, D.D.

A persistent element in the world-ideal of the greatest Hebrew prophets was peace among all nations. It is an interesting fact that the rule of the peaceful Solomon, and not the rule of the great soldier David, furnished the type of national glory upon which the minds of succeeding generations loved most to dwell and which gave form to their prophetic forecast.

Equally is universal peace a main feature of the world-ideal which Christianity presents. As, in the conception of the olden prophet, the Messiah was to speak peace unto the nations, so, in the conception of New Testament apostle and seer, the Christ is to bring "peace on earth and good will among men."

Modern scientific altruism agrees with Hebrew and Christian prophecy in its prognostication of universal peace. The philosophy of evolution, in which the element of conflict fills so large a place, as it passes to the moral plane, speaking through the poet Tennyson, bids man

"Move upward, working out the beast,  
And let the ape and tiger die."

From the religious, from the ethical, and from the scientific point of view, an invincible logic leads us forward in thought to a time when war will cease to be a possible condition of profit or progress, and humanity will attain unto universal peace realized through universal co-operation under the benign and sovereign law of love.

To the superficial observer, indeed, as he looks out upon the modern world with its vast military and naval equipment, and sees the nations armed to the teeth, and maintaining a system of conscription that makes almost every able bodied man, at least in Europe, a soldier, humanity seems far enough from the ideal. Never was military science so highly developed, never were weapons of offence and defence so powerful and deadly, and never were the destructive possibilities of war so enormous as now. And yet never was there a time when the friends of peace had such large and solid reasons for encouragement and hope as they have to-day. The very multiplication and perfection of the means for destroying life, as has often been pointed out, is accomplishing this good result, of impressing upon all but the most stolid minds the utter madness and wickedness of war.

During the last twenty years there has been rapid progress towards the permanent establishment of international peace. The change in the material situation by the increased application of scientific discovery and intelligence

to the art of war, which to many people seems so marked a change for the worse, is more than offset by the great change in the economic and moral situation. The present condition of Christendom with respect to the question of war is better than it seems. While military experts have been applying the latest conclusions of science to the development of military art, many experts in morals have been applying the conclusions of ethical inquiry to international relations. Meantime the people have been slowly awakening to the real significance of war. There is more serious and more widely-extended reflection on the wastefulness and immorality of war. In increasing numbers men are questioning the necessity and reasonableness of the appeal to arms. They are beginning to suspect that what they have heretofore accepted as a normal feature of human life is abnormal and monstrous because at last it has been outgrown. The recent action of the British Parliament in unanimously passing a resolution in favor of meeting the friendly overtures of the American government with respect to the conclusion of a permanent treaty of arbitration is significant of a great change which is rapidly taking place in the public mind.

The two governments in their action are reflecting the popular conviction and confirming the popular judgment. It is interesting to remember that Mr. Cremer, Sir John Lubbock and the English Peace Society have urged this resolution on Parliament for many years, and, at last, the House of Commons has awakened to the discovery "that what had previously been declared to be impossible, unconstitutional and most inexpedient, has now become so obviously desirable that not a single hostile vote could be registered against the motion."

Is not this the beginning of the realization of that dream which has haunted prophetic minds among peace men for many years—the establishment of a Universal High Court of Arbitration through which war is to be finally abolished?

At last war is on the defensive. It has reached the apologetic stage. Its old assurance and arrogance are passing away. Even military budgets, once so popular, must now be excused to the people, and the main argument urged in their favor is the necessity of preserving peace. Conquest, extension of territory and glory even have lost their spell.

The principal arguments by which war is now defended—it is no longer advocated—are

(1) *Its antiquity.* Men say war always has been, therefore it must always be. The inanity of the argument is too apparent. Once small-pox and the cholera took their unobstructed way through communities and continents; but intelligence and care have almost extirpated the former, and the latter is rapidly losing its terrors.

For long ages slavery cursed the human race; to-day it maintains a precarious existence only among savage or barbarous peoples. Duelling, which was for centuries a recognized means of avenging affronts to honor and settling disputes between man and man, has ceased to be reputable, is branded by civil law in most countries as a crime, and has ceased to exist save rarely in a few exceptional communities. War has lingered long, and may linger still, but it too is doomed to extinction.

(2) But, it is urged that *human nature* will of necessity perpetuate war. Men will always be subject to uncontrollable passion. Selfishness and hatred—greed of gain and lust of power—will always dominate.

But this is to ignore or deny the moral progress of the species. The error of the older economists was their assumption that selfishness is the strongest, the most persistent and the only stable motive to human action. But strong as selfishness is, it is weaker than love. Surely, if slowly, men are learning that they are bound together by ties which cannot be broken without loss and suffering to all. The real gain of each is the gain of all.

What is true of the family and the community is true of the nation; and, we are beginning to see, it is true also of the race. No nation can gain permanently at the expense of another nation.

History is the record of human progress. The progress has not been uniform. There are eddies and back-currents in the stream. But age by age humanity advances. The average of human nature is higher to-day than at any time in the past. Men are steadily growing less cruel, less bestial and less selfish.

Once war was the chronic, we might even say the normal, condition of humanity. Now it confessedly is exceptional. Once a vocation, now it is, at most, an avocation. Once a daily regimen, it is now an extreme and critical measure like a surgical operation.

Everything points to its ultimate abandonment. Once nations were natural and instinctive enemies to each other; now they are bound together by a thousand ties of mutual knowledge, commerce, industry, science, education and charity. Men in the mass are becoming more humane. National antipathies have disappeared or have lost their ancient strength.

(3) A third and favorite argument in defence of war is the claim that there is no power, save the military power, to guarantee the fulfilment of treaties. Civil law has its sanctions in police and courts and prisons; so international law must have its sanctions in armies and navies.

But this argument ignores the truth that the real guarantees of civil law are moral rather than material. The peace of a community is preserved by the moral sentiment of the majority. The public conscience has far greater force than police and military combined. This conservative force, inhering in the intelligence and moral sense of the people, grows stronger continually.

The disposition of men to trust the corporate man, that is the community or the nation, for the maintenance and protection of their rights, increases with the development of civilization.

We have but to broaden our application of the principle which we daily see to be operative in the narrow sphere of the nation, to the family of nations. The union of the nations in a treaty of arbitration and peace which shall create an International Court, would rapidly develop an international consciousness like that national consciousness which now underlies the daily life and preserves the internal order of each individual nation.

The peaceful adjudication of international differences would soon become a habit.

Already the practice of arbitration has been carried so far between England and the United States that the suggestion of war between these two countries would be treated as absurd by the vast majority of those people on both sides of the Atlantic who form public sentiment and shape public action.

The influence of the example set by the English-speaking nations must be far-reaching and powerful.

(4) But it is urged finally, that *readiness for war insures peace: si vis pacem, para bellum*. There is a certain plausibility in this contention that hides its deep-lying fallacy. Once it was true. It is still true, perhaps, of those civilized communities that border on savage tribes. The show of brute force affects the brutal mind. But of the nations of Christendom it is no longer true. In a civilized community no man needs to carry weapons of defence to insure the respect of his neighbors and prevent them from encroaching on his rights.

We do not keep muskets stacked in the front halls of our dwellings and gatling guns mounted at our windows. In all this broad land there is not a city that has fortifications and armed sentries. There is no more real necessity for forts and camps bristling with rifles along the frontiers of European countries than there is for a cordon of troops around this building. Do not think me extravagant. I say "real necessity."

Why should Frenchmen and Germans hold themselves ready to blow out each others' brains? There are bitter memories still alive, and "Alsace" and "Lorraine" still exert an ominous spell over the minds of many in both nations. But that spell is kept active and powerful by the proximity of French and German armies. Readiness for war, instead of insuring peace, is a constant provocative of war. Huge standing armies perpetuate and nourish the martial spirit.

The possession of powerful weapons, such as the modern war-ships carry, is almost inseparable from a temptation to use them. Of what earthly use are these floating fortresses and colossal guns save for the hellish purpose of destroying human lives? Of what use are vast armies of economically unproductive men, drilled and uniformed and armed, save for the purpose of butchering each other in the shortest possible time? War is the *raison d'être* of the soldier. The "piping times of peace" are abhorrent to him, save as he is much more a citizen than a soldier, and then the enforced idleness or fruitless activity of military life are unspeakably irksome to him.

In the present stage of human progress the true maxim is "If you desire peace prepare for peace."

Consider what would be the effect of a general European disarmament? It would practically make war impossible. It would dispel the temptation to national disagreements. It would remove the irritable susceptibility which standing armies in close proximity to each other inevitably create. It would permit the natural and easy intercommunication of adjacent peoples, and let the peaceful and beneficent impulses of social and commercial interchange weave nation to nation in ties of mutual good-will and profit. When men cannot fight they seldom wish to fight. Power almost inevitably carries with it the disposition to use power. If the great Nations of Europe would consent to a mutual reduction of armies to a merely police footing, war would be eliminated from the possibilities of the future.

The impracticability of such a step lies only in the difficulty which inheres in a long-continued and traditional way of thinking. If peoples can be brought to see that the right thing is always both the practicable and the profitable thing, they will throw away their military equipments as long ago men threw away the sword and pistol

which once were a part of every gentleman's habitual dress.

Let us now consider, somewhat in detail,

#### I. THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

The more familiar social results of war I may pass over with a few words. Of the horrors of war in its destruction of human lives and all the frightful sequence of physical suffering and mental anguish, I need not speak here. The picture cannot be overdrawn. History is full of the awful tragedy. Let those who would know the ghastly reality read Baroness Von Suttner's *Die Waffen Nieder* ("Lay down your Arms"), or Emile Zola's *La Débâcle* ("The Smash Up"). The former is much the better, since its *motif* is nobler, but either one will give to the inexperienced mind an impression of the prosaic and actual aspect of war which never can be forgotten.\*

From the social point of view war is evil, and only evil.

1. Because it is, to the last extreme, *economically wasteful*.

In the *first* place, it causes immense destruction of economic values. Aside from the enormous consumption of agricultural and mechanical products incident to the support of troops in camp or in the field, there is always a great amount of sheer destruction caused by the operations of armies both on the march and in battle. Conflagration accompanies war as its inseparable companion. The country which is the scene of a military campaign is wasted and desolated as if it had been swept by furies. Farms and vineyards, granaries and orchards, factories and villages are trampled and shattered and consumed. Harvests are left ungathered or are reaped by sickles of flame. Cattle and sheep are slaughtered or dispersed beyond recovery. Horses are drafted into the service of death and perish miserably with their drivers or riders. In the economic waste the victors suffer only less than the vanquished. There is nothing more frightful than a great victory, save a great defeat. Always there is loss. That is the one constant feature of a modern war. And, in almost every case, it is loss without compensating gain.

In the *second* place there is economic waste in the abstraction from the countries engaged in strife of vast productive force. A million men in arms are a million workers removed from the cultivation of the soil and the mechanic arts. Even in time of peace the army is a constant and heavy drain on the productive energies of a nation; for thousands of artisans must idle, in camps or spend in drill the strength that would enrich communities with industrial products.

It is true that certain kinds of industry are stimulated by war. Factories for the manufacture of weapons and ammunition and the various materials necessary to military equipment do a thriving business, but almost their entire product is destined to speedy destruction. But while these industries are stimulated the beneficent arts of peace which make for a nation's prosperity and moral advantage inevitably languish. The condition of a nation engaged in war ceases to be normal and healthful. It is like that of the human body which a serious wound fills with fever. The natural and healthy functions of every organ are disturbed. With every day of war the nation grows poorer and weaker.

In the *third* place there is economic waste in the derangement of public finance and the costly accumulation of

debt to burden succeeding generations with heavy taxes on all forms of industry. The workers of the world to-day are giving a large percentage of their annual product to pay the interest on the cost of past folly and crime in the shape of needless wars. The National Debts of eighteen European States in 1891, amounted to about five thousand million pounds sterling, or 24,350 million dollars, the great proportion of which huge sum has been incurred, directly or indirectly, by war. The interest on these debts amounts to 220 million pounds, or 1,071,400,000 dollars. The world is poorer by many billions of dollars and lower by many degrees in the scale of economic advancement than it would have been but for wars.

2. But war is not only economically wasteful, it is also *politically evil*. With rare possible exceptions it obstructs the progress of popular freedom. War is the natural accompaniment and ally of despotism. The military spirit and habit are hostile to that free exercise of individual judgment and free play of individual action which are necessary to the best political life.

In spite of wars and conscriptions the nations have advanced in political liberty, but their advance has been retarded or made unspeakably costly by a widespread and despotic militarism.

Free men make the best soldiers, it is true; but soldiers do not, save rarely, make the best free men.

War has overthrown many a political constitution. Republics that become possessed of the military spirit invite the dictatorship that ends in monarchy.

3. War is obstructive of the social integration of humanity through which it obtains its highest development.

Let me pause here to state explicitly what has been implied in this entire discussion. We must discriminate between war as an exceptional and extreme act of self-defence, and war as the result and expression of a deep-rooted and long cultivated disposition. The military spirit and habit find their natural and logical expression in wars of aggression for the sake of gain in wealth or territory or power. Most wars are of the latter class. Most revolutions have been struggles for self-preservation against the encroachments of tyranny supported by force of arms.

Our contention is against war, as an institution, the inevitable product of the military spirit. War, thus defined, is always and everywhere obstructive of social progress. A war may seem, incidentally, to aid social progress by producing changes which liberate social forces previously latent, but this is much like the contribution to a man's wealth which fire makes when it consumes his house by revealing gold that had been secreted in its walls. Human society advances in spite of the obstructing and demoralizing influences of military conflict. War thrives on national antipathies. It intensifies that national selfishness which makes nations Ishmaelites, every one with its hand against its fellow.

The natural and normal tendency of mankind is toward unity of thought and interest and action. Human progress is advancement toward the realization of this unity throughout the entire race. It does not involve the destruction of national individuality any more than the unity of the family involves the destruction of the individuality of its members. The law of the universe is diversity in unity. The individual man completes himself in the unity

\*Another, and still more powerful book than either of the above, is Count Tolstói's "Peace and War."

of the family; the family completes itself in the unity of the nation; and the nation completes itself in the unity of mankind. "The Parliament of man, the federation of the world" is not the mere dream of a poet, but the certain goal of a great and inevitable sociological tendency and movement. "God hath made of one [family] every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." The real history of man reveals a two-fold process going on slowly from the beginning of his existence. On the one hand is the process of individualization by which is produced an ever finer and higher, and more distinct type of the individual soul. Savages are much alike, as cattle in a herd. They are gregarious as are cattle. Civilized men are not gregarious but social, that is, companionable, through intellectual and moral affinities; but they are individualized so that their diversity is enormously increased. Each man is more significant and of higher value in the scale of being.

On the other hand is the process of integration, by which is produced a higher collective life that expresses itself in a complex and coherent social organization. Society is the product of the intellectual and moral development of men. It is not the result of congenital or geographical relations, but of spiritual affinities which spring from the universal unifying force of love. God is love. The unity of man is in God, the infinite Life that animates and sustains all.

The tendency toward a closer social unity of mankind which we see working in thousand fold ways — in international commerce and charity, in interchange of literatures, and in the ever increasing number of political, ethnological, social and religious Congresses, — is but the working of the universal force of spiritual gravitation by which the multiform life of humanity is drawn to its true centre and unity in God, and which is to culminate in the final perfect social organization of the race in the Kingdom of God.

War, the product of selfishness, promotes as well as expresses selfish and destructive antagonisms. It rudely cuts the filaments of interest and good will which bind peoples together. It segregates when naturally men would unite, and so retards the divine beneficent process of social integration by which the nations of the earth are to be bound in a universal brotherhood of mutual love and service.

The philosophy of evolution, which approaches the problem of human life from the purely scientific side, while accounting for wars in the past, interpreting them on the material plane as features of the struggle for existence through which the fittest survive, logically points to the abolition of war.

The moment we pass up from the material plane to the moral, the evolution takes on new phases. On the higher plane it is the morally fittest that survive, and the morally fittest survive not by destruction but by conservation, that is by service. The strong protect the weak so that the weak become strong. Man climbs not by pushing down his rival but by lifting him up, so that both mount together.

From the social point of view, then, war is evil and only evil. It destroys or hinders the largest products of industry, and is therefore economically wasteful. It represses the instincts of freedom and retards the progress of civil liberty, and is therefore politically evil. It checks the great social tendency towards the integration and

unity of the nations of the world in a common life of mutual good will and mutual helpfulness, and is therefore socially maleficent.

## II. THE MORAL ASPECTS OF WAR.

These are more serious than the social aspects of war, considered from the economic or scientific point of view. Indeed, the two are not separable, save in thought. So much of the moral aspect has been involved in the preceding discussion that I need dwell on it now but a few minutes.

Some one has suggested that there is always a ludicrous element in evil.

This is because evil is in the last degree unreasonable, that is, in so far as it is the direct product of human choice.

The humorist cannot read the history of man without sometimes feeling the absurdity of much human action so deeply as to wonder whether even the gods do not indulge at times in Cyclopean laughter.

How often poor man has pulled his helmet or military cap over his eyes, and straightway played the fool on a colossal scale. Ah, but the pity of it is that his folly is provocative of tears and groans instead of mirth. There is a vast absurdity in war. Recall those words of Titanic sarcasm in "Sartor Resartus":

"What, speaking in quite unofficial language, is the net purport and upshot of War? To my own knowledge, for example, there dwell and toil, in the British village of Dumdrudge, usually some five hundred souls. From these, by certain 'Natural Enemies' of the French, there are successively selected, during the French War, say thirty able-bodied men; Dumdrudge, at her own expense, has suckled and nursed them; she has, not without difficulty and sorrow, fed them up to manhood, and even trained them to crafts, so that one can weave, another build, another hammer, and the weakest can stand under thirty stone avoirdupois. Nevertheless, amid much weeping and swearing, they are selected; all dressed in red; and shipped away, at the public charges, some two thousand miles, or say only to the south of Spain; and fed there till wanted. And now to that same spot in the south of Spain, are thirty similar French artisans, from a French Dumdrudge, in like manner wending; till at length, after infinite effort, the two parties come into actual juxtaposition; and Thirty stands fronting Thirty, each with a gun in his hand; straightway the word 'Fire' is given; and they blow the souls out of one another; and in place of sixty brisk, useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead carcasses, which it must bury, and anew shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the Devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a Universe, there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! their Governors had fallen out; and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot. Alas, so it is in Deutschland, and hitherto in all lands; still as of old, 'What devilry soever Kings do, the Greeks must pay the piper!'"

In the vast majority of cases the unprejudiced and clear-seeing observer must affirm that war is unnecessary and futile. In view of its character and its tragic results it is therefore immoral. It can justify itself at all only by producing benefits that are greater than the evils it

has wrought. Failing to do this it is immoral and utterly condemnable.

Now in the *first* place war is directly opposed to the law of love. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is a fundamental principle of rational ethics. Love never works harm; it seeks and accomplishes only good. But war, if not the expression of hatred between the contending nations, rapidly develops hatred that is passionate and pitiless. Meanwhile in its every stage it works harm to all concerned. In a word war unjustified by a clear moral necessity, is murder, robbery and arson on a colossal scale. It is indiscriminating murder. The innocent suffer with the constructively guilty, and often the innocent suffer the most.

In the *second* place, war is enormously prolific of vices and crimes. Cruelty, drunkenness and licentiousness thrive in camp and field, and spread like a contagious disease through communities that are infected by the presence of armies. Long after armies are disbanded the bad product survives and perpetuates itself. Always the morality of civil life is lowered by a war, and at its close, and long after, criminal statistics show a marked increase.

Military life promotes an appalling carelessness of human life and great disregard of rights in property. Often the forager becomes a thief. Unquestionably there has been vast improvement in military discipline in recent times and the property and lives of non-combatants are much safer now than in former times. But the best that can be said is that there has been a reduction of the evils incident to war. Those evils cannot be wholly abated while war continues to be the means of settling international differences.

As long as men in uniform are licensed to kill and rob and burn, so long will there be a baleful overflow of destructive force, and many men out of uniform will continue the habits of vice and crime once formed under the assumed exigencies of military campaigns.

In one word, then, let it be said plainly, that war contradicts the fundamental principles of morality, often stunts or destroys the noblest virtues, promotes the worst vices, and retards the moral progress of the species.

But it is said that war certainly promotes virtues, such as courage and fortitude and self-sacrifice. This is true only in a qualified sense. A battle undoubtedly gives scope for virtues of a high sort. Many a bloody field has been glorified by sublimest courage and self-sacrifice. Many soldiers have proved themselves heroic and magnanimous in the deadly crisis of armed conflict. But war does not make a hero out of a poltroon nor a saint out of a dastardly sinner. The brave and virtuous man will be a brave and virtuous soldier, but there is no power of alchemy in bloody strife to transform the base metal of truculence into the gold of real courage. Besides, whatever scope war may give for chivalric and virtuous action, peace gives wider scope for the development and exercise of all virtues. That land is unworthy of liberty which ever suffers the memory of its patriotic defenders on the field of blood to be forgotten, but it is also unworthy and incapable of continued existence if it does not produce contestants on the bloodless fields of peace whose virtues are quite as high as those which shone with transfiguring splendor amidst the murky clouds of battle-smoke.

It is easier to be a good soldier than to be a good citizen. It is easier to die for one's country in the intoxicating enthusiasm of war than it is to live for one's country

amidst the subtle temptations to self-indulgence or selfish ambition in time of peace. Every day of our life brings opportunities for heroism. Every sphere of industry gives scope for manifold virtues. The world needs men of honor and industry and benevolence far more than it needs disciplined and skilful soldiers. The faithful citizen, the wise philanthropist, the patient scholar, the diligent artisan, the devoted servant of the public good, all these are needed on loftier and grander fields of action than were ever swept by the armies of a Napoleon or a Von Moltke.

Let us stand with our faces to the future. "*Lebe die Zukunft!*" War belongs to the past with its long, slow struggle out of bestiality and barbarism. With widening intelligence men rise to higher planes of endeavor and conflict. The brotherhood of man is no longer a dream but a begun and growing experience. The nations are clasping hands, even here in "the White City," in a firm pact of mutual good will and mutual service. The arts of peace are driving out the horrid arts of war. East and West, North and South, the nations are feeling a common impulse. It is the gentle but strong force of universal love pulsing from the heart of the Eternal God.

The Christ, who came as the Prince of Peace, at last will see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied. Already the prophetic eye beholds the dawn of that day

"When the war-drums throb no longer and the battle-flags are furled,  
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

## THE FRATERNAL UNION OF PEOPLES.

RY HODGSON PRATT.

(Paper written by request of the Committee for the Organization of the FIFTH UNIVERSAL PEACE CONGRESS, held at Chicago.)

### (I.) INTERNATIONAL ANIMOSITIES AND THEIR CAUSES.

(1) When the writer of this paper visited Buda-Pesth in order to establish an Arbitration and Peace Society, he paid a visit to the Cardinal Archbishop of Hungary, who, on learning the object of the interview, at once observed: "If you want to get rid of war, you must get rid of the hatreds which lie so deep in men's minds."

There is, undoubtedly, much truth in the Cardinal's remark; and in the former ages of the world's history every little tribe of men was animated by hatred against other tribes. In due course, however, a better comprehension of what was demanded by self-interest, led the hostile tribes to combine in larger groups, and to put some limit to their internecine rivalries. They had discovered that an interchange of services and of products was more advantageous than conflict. In fact, men came to learn that Trade was more profitable than War.

In the slow course of time, each race or nation has, owing to a thousand influences, acquired certain qualities of brain and hand which differentiate it from all the others.

Each, therefore, needs the others, and the latter need each, until at last there comes that "unity in diversity" which is seen in a Swiss or American Federation, and through which men of many languages, religions and races constitute a harmonious and prosperous community.

Unhappily, the world at large is, as yet, far from a condition of things like that indicated by such a phrase as "The United States of Europe." In that part of the